Faculty Meeting Agenda
21 March 2005

Call to order at 4:10 p.m., Sinclair Auditorium
Refreshments will be served at 3:30 p.m.

1. Minutes

Corrections or approval of the 7 February 2005 faculty meeting minutes.

2. Memorial Resolution

- Professor Bob Folk will give the memorial resolution for Cassius Curtis professor emeritus of physics.

- Professor Ed Evenson will give the memorial resolution for James M. Parks, professor emeritus of geological sciences.

3. Committee Motions

- Graduate and Research Committee – Professor Jill Schneider Course and curriculum changes.

  Motions are available on the Registrar’s web page:
  http://www.lehigh.edu/~inrgs/ccindex.shtml

- Educational Policy Committee – Professor David Small Course and curriculum changes.

  Motions are available on the Registrar’s web page:
  http://www.lehigh.edu/~inrgs/ccindex.shtml

- Faculty Steering Committee – Professor Rosemary Mundhenk Proposal for changes in University policy-structure statement.

  Motion emailed to faculty on 10 March 2005.

4. Unfinished Business

5. New Business

6. Committee Reports
Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

21 March 2005

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (Sinclair Auditorium)

President Farrington called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.

1. Minutes. The minutes of the February 7, 2005 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

2. Memorial Resolutions. Professor Beall Fowler read a tribute to Cassius Curtis, late Professor Emeritus of Physics. Professor Fowler then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 1] and that a copy be sent to the family. The President declared the motion APPROVED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD for a moment of silence in memory of Cassius Curtis.

Professor Ed Evenson read a tribute to James M. Parks, late Professor Emeritus of Geological Sciences. Professor Evenson then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 2] and that a copy be sent to the family. The President declared the motion APPROVED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD for a moment of silence in memory of James M. Parks.

3. Committee Motions. Professor Jill Schneider, on behalf of the Graduate and Research Committee, MOVED the entire set of GRC course and curriculum changes as a package [see the binder in the Faculty Secretary’s Office]. The motion was SECONDED. The motion PASSED.

Professor David Small, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, MOVED the course and curriculum changes for the College of Arts and Sciences as a package [see the binder in the Faculty Secretary’s Office]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Small then MOVED the course and curriculum changes for the College of Business and Economics as a package [see the binder in the Faculty Secretary’s Office]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Small then MOVED the course and curriculum changes for the P.C. Rossin College of Engineering and Applied Science as a package [see the binder in the Faculty Secretary’s Office]. The motion was
SECONDED and PASSED.

Professors Rosemary Mundhenk and Alwyn Eades, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee, MOVED the Revised Policy Structure statement [see Attachment 3]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Eades noted that the statement has no authority to change the original document adopted by the Board of Trustees. The revised statement is intended to encourage the trustees to make changes to the original document.

Professor Rich Aronson asked if there was reason to believe that the trustees will accept the changes. Professor Eades said it was likely that the administration will recommend the changes to the board, and it is likely the board will accept the changes.

President Farrington replied in the affirmative.

The motion PASSED.


6. Committee Reports. Professor Tom Hyclak, on behalf of the Personnel Committee Subcommittee on Tenure and Promotion Policy, gave a report on the work of the subcommittee. There will be two open meetings on Wednesday and Thursday of this week in UC 303. The committee is seeking faculty input on the major issues on Promotion and Tenure policies. These include the creation of a university-wide P&T committee, changes to R&P sections on faculty responsibility, questions about tenure-by-default, and restrictions on external reviewers.

Professor Mike Kolchin, on behalf of the New Governance Committee, provided an update on the committee's activities. The committee will flesh out the details of the 'Traister Report' and hold town meetings in the fall. Committee members include Professor Kolchin as chair, and Professors Slade Cargill, Michael Gill, Art King, Alastair McAulay, John Pettigrew, Jean Soderlund, Barbara Traister and George White. The committee's first meeting is March 28.

7. President's Report. President Farrington noted that acceptances for the Class of 2009 go out next week. The university achieved an all-time high in the number of applications (10,487). The enrollment goal for the class is 1,145 students, of which approximately 41% have already committed to Lehigh. This represents Lehigh's best early decision outcome ever. The president asked for the faculty's help during the month of April.
The capital campaign has raised $223 million so far. The halfway point of $250 million is expected to be reached by June.

"No Parking" is coming to the campus as several building projects will be under way by June.

Maya Angelou will be the commencement speaker.

Professor Eades noted that a recent Chronicle of Higher Education article on endowments and fundraising did not mention Lehigh. President Farrington replied that this will be the university's best fundraising year ever.

Professor Suchakar Neti asked if applications were keeping up with demographics. The president replied that applications are growing faster than the demographics.

Professor Aronson asked if the early admission percentage is larger than normal. The president replied in the affirmative.

When asked about the diversity of the incoming class, the president admitted that Lehigh has to do better. Progress is being made but not as fast as desired.

8. Provost's Report. Provost Mohamed el-Aasser began by introducing Associate Dean Carl Moses who gave a status report on the Middle States accreditation project [see Attachment 4]. Dean Moses also noted that the Middle States review has evolved toward greater emphasis on outcomes and assessment.

The provost updated the faculty hiring report. Seven offers have been accepted and three more offers are outstanding.

Professor Neti asked about Professor of Practice hiring. The provost replied that there have been two hires each in the College of Business and Economics and the College of Education.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:14 PM.

Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: sft@
Memorial Resolution for
Cassius W. Curtis
March 21, 2005

It is with deep sorrow that the faculty of Lehigh University records the death of Professor of Physics Emeritus Cassius W. Curtis on December 17, 2004.

Cassius was born in Noblesville, Indiana in 1906. His education in physics started at Williams College, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and was awarded a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1928. During the next two years, he was an Instructor of Physics at Hamilton College, which awarded him a Master of Arts degree in 1930. His graduate studies continued at Princeton University, where the top physicists in the world were exploiting the new field of quantum mechanics to understand the world of atoms by measuring the properties of the light emitted by these fundamental pieces of matter. Cassius earned his Ph.D. in 1936 at Princeton for his research in this field of atomic spectroscopy.

After receiving his Ph.D., his career as a physics professor began when he accepted an appointment as an assistant professor at Western Reserve University in 1936. As with so many physicists at the time, his teaching career was interrupted in 1942 by the call to contribute to war research. He returned to Princeton for fundamental studies for the U.S. Army on the dynamic behavior of metals in order to improve the ability of armor plate to stop the new high-speed shells that penetrated existing armor.

In 1946, Cassius left Princeton to accept a position as an associate professor of physics at Lehigh. Two years later he was promoted to full professor. This was a rebuilding time for Lehigh, which had furloughed most of the faculty during the Second World War; only one physics professor, Charles Bidwell, had survived the cutbacks. Lehigh's new president, Martin Whitaker, who was a physicist, knew he needed established physicists to rebuild the Physics Department. And so, Cassius joined with Ray Emrich, Frank Myers, and Peter Hayas in leading the successful building of a strong graduate-level department, which was soon recognized in an American Physical Society publication as one of the top fifty departments in graduate-student enrollments in the country. Cassius was especially responsible for the reputation of Lehigh's graduate physics program since he successfully directed sixteen Ph.D. dissertations and many masters' theses during his tenure here. Tales of how they owe their careers in physics to Cassius are told and retold whenever and wherever his former graduate students meet.

Cassius's research accomplishments in several areas of physics were acknowledged by the American Physical Society when they elected him to be a fellow of the Society. Most physicists are experimentalists or theorists; Cassius was both. Besides carrying out brilliant experiments in spectroscopy, optics and the dynamic properties of metals, Cassius led a group who developed methods for solving the partial differential equations satisfied by the tensor stresses and strains of solids and liquids.
In addition to his fame as a director of graduate research, Cassius was equally recognized as an exciting teacher of undergraduates. Many students from various science and engineering departments as well as physics majors took his course on solid-state physics. Recognized as an expert on spectroscopy, he taught a course on this topic that was an important introduction for undergraduates on the use of quantum mechanics to understand atoms and other fundamental particles. He even found time to teach a senior course on optics and to equip and teach a laboratory course on optics.

In the midst of all these graduate and undergraduate research and teaching activities, Professor Curtis is remembered by thousands of Lehigh's alumni as the lecturer in our introductory course in physics for science and engineering students. Cassius received the Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching in 1963.

The reputation of our department and that of all of Lehigh were significantly diminished when Cassius retired in 1971. His contributions to Lehigh and to physics have been continued, at least in part, by his many students who have tried to emulate their teacher.

Cassius and his wife Ruth were well-known tennis players in Bethlehem for many years. As physical conditions changed, Cassius played less tennis and spent more time on his garden. He loved to watch plants grow. For many winters, he and Al McLennan would meet to study garden catalogues while making the big decision on what plants to order and when to order them so they would be prepared for spring planting.

At the time of his death, Cassius and Ruth were married for sixty-two years. They had three sons, and eventually seven grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. Tragically, their son C. Gregory Curtis died in 1996. Their son Neil H. Curtis lives in Bethlehem and son Jacob L. Curtis lives in Berkeley, California.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond Emrich
Robert Folk
Beall Fowler
Wesley Smith

President Parrington, I move that this memorial resolution be made a permanent part of the faculty record by being included in the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to the members of Professor Curtis's family.
March 21, 2005

The faculty of Lehigh University records with sorrow the death on January 29, 2005 of Dr. James M. Parks, Professor Emeritus of the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences. A revered teacher and scholar of Geology and Paleontology who left behind a Professor legacy of deep intellect unbounded energy, devoted students and sincere friendships.

Jim Parks was born April 1, 1925 in Topeka, Kansas and grew up in the Mid-West. Jim graduated Phi Beta Kappa with an A.B. (1948) from the University of Kansas, followed by a MS (1949) and Ph.D. (1951) from the University of Wisconsin. Jim began his geological career at Shell Oil's Exploration and Production Laboratory, in Houston, TX in 1952 and subsequently (1960) moved to the Pure Oil Research Center in Crystal Lake, IL and then in 1965, to Union Oil Research Center in Brea, CA. Jim's early interests spanned a wide range of topics including: thermoluminescence, Stratigraphy, Paleontology, gas chromatography and the early use of computers for geological exploration. Prior to leaving his beloved "oil patch" Jim published extensively on thermoluminescence and the radioactivity and paleontology of limestones. In July of 1967 Jim joined the Lehigh faculty as the Director of the Marine Science Center (MSC - formerly "Center for Marine and Environmental Studies") and Associate Professor of Geology. He was promoted to Professor of Geological Sciences in 1970. His research at Lehigh University was centered on numerical geology, shape analysis and fluidization. He trained over twenty graduate students and provided computer and numerical guidance to all who asked, and many who didn't.

In his twenty years at Lehigh University Jim mentored both students and young faculty often introducing them to his colleagues at Oil companies and funding agencies. Jim knew, and was respected by, every Paleontologist in the country. He published extensively on grain-shape analysis and fluidization of tidal inlets. In 1987 Jim took early retirement from Lehigh University and shortly thereafter moved to his retirement home in Kentucky. But Jim did not really "retire" at all! He immediately founded "STAY DEEP" a company designed to apply the principles of fluidization that Jim developed at Lehigh and, at the time of his death, Jim was actively working on two books (one on the influence of oil company research laboratories on Geology and the other a mystery novel centered on a Geologist) and a bibliography of Dr. Lowellaudon – a famous field Geologist at the University of Wisconsin who had a profound affect on the careers of Jim and numerous other Wisconsin graduates.
Jim will forever be remembered by his students and colleagues, as a vibrant, magnificent person and a kind, and gentle giant of great intellect. His death leaves a void in our community that will inevitably fill with wonderful memories of this marvelous man and his many contributions.

Mr. President: On behalf of the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences and the College of Arts and Sciences, I ask that this memorial statement be incorporated as part of the permanent record of this faculty and that copies be shared with his widow, Joyce and with their three children, Linda, Steven and Joel and with his brother Gabe, and his sister Paula.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward B. Everson
Professor
Policy Structure

(Proposed as a replacement to the Policy Structure adopted by the Board of Trustees in June, 2002)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board of Trustees of Lehigh University has the overall legal authority and responsibility for establishing policy and policy-making procedures for the University. The purpose of this document, which articulates a policy in its own right, is to provide a policy structure that will assist the Board of Trustees in meeting their policy responsibilities. Its intent is to ensure that Lehigh University's policies are legally sound, meet the highest fiduciary standards, and wisely provide for the future intellectual and financial health of the University and the furtherance of its missions.

The intention of the Board of Trustees is that Lehigh University will always have a comprehensive structured body of institutional policy that provides a rational and consistent institutional context for decisions and actions by campus leaders and individuals. Such a body of policy must be living and the policies themselves must be principled, not procedural. The interests of both the University and the individual should be evident in the policies, and they should be part of a foundation of understanding and trust between the University as an institution and the individual members of the University community.

With the benefits of policy protections that apply to individual members of the Lehigh Community come the responsibility of being informed about current policies and the obligation to abide by them. The Administration has the responsibility to disseminate the policies well, to provide easy access to them, and execute them effectively and consistently.

This document classifies policies into three categories that are addressed in separate sections. These categories are University Policies, Faculty Policies, and Administrative Policies. A final section addresses operational elements of this policy. This policy on Policy Structure does not limit the authority of the Board of Trustees to enact policy in the best interest of the institution independent of this policy should the need arise.

In approving this policy on Policy Structure, the Board of Trustees delegates to the President the responsibility for executing all aspects of this policy except those specifically requiring Trustee action. Required Board of Trustee approvals may come through the Board Committee structure or via full Board endorsement and will always be
reflected in the Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Trustees providing a permanent record of Trustee policy actions. As a Policy of the Trustees this document is subject to periodic review and revision by the Board of Trustees when deemed appropriate by the Board.

II. UNIVERSITY POLICIES

A modern university is an integrated community made up of three distinct sub communities — faculty, staff, and students — working together to create and transfer knowledge. Even though faculty, staff and students have significantly different roles and responsibilities in the larger university community, there are important overarching policy issues of common concern that should be addressed by University Policies and these policies should apply to the entire Lehigh University community. This section is devoted to the establishment of a body of University Policies.

Although the number of issues that merit a University Policy is relatively small, the importance of well-crafted University Policies cannot be understated. They can help bind the community together and define Lehigh University for all its constituents. It is desirable that policies have broad community support. (Note 1). Consequently, effective communication with the faculty, staff and students during the creation of a University Policy is essential.

The President is delegated the responsibility of developing draft University Policies as needed, either as a result of policy issues arising on the campus or at the request of the Trustees. The final approval of University Policies rests with the Board of Trustees.

University Policies should be limited to fundamentally important and broadly applicable issues. Review, comments and recommendations of particular and appropriate groups, such as faculty, staff and students, should also be solicited and carefully considered. This process of review shall include a timely role of the Faculty, although of course such a role is not binding on the Board of Trustees. There may be occasions when the Board of Trustees does not have time to complete the normal process of consultation, and is obliged to act without such consultation. In such cases, the Board of Trustees will carry out a subsequent process of consultation regarding the policy adopted, and revise it, if the Board deems it appropriate. (Note 2). The Board of Trustees should be fully informed of the results of the campus review of a proposed University Policy as part of their approval process.

The President will also delegate responsibility within the University Administration for cataloguing, disseminating, executing, and maintaining University Policies.

III. FACULTY POLICIES

The Faculty, because of its essential role in the educational mission of the University, must also play a unique and critical role in the policy arena along with the Board of
Trustees. This section articulates the broad principles under which the Faculty is delegated appropriate policy responsibilities within the educational mission of the University.

Only the Board of Trustees can grant tenure, promote faculty, and approve new degree programs, but in executing these responsibilities, the recommendations and (Note 1) advice of the faculty (Note 1) are essential ingredients. Consequently, the relationship between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees in policy matters is an important one requiring good communication and mutual understanding. In particular, the Board of Trustees must rely on sound faculty governance principles and procedures that both guide the daily educational mission and bring important decisions to them.

All university-wide policies affecting the employment of the instructional staff for the educational mission of Lehigh require the formal approval of the Board of Trustees. This body of policy includes appointment, tenure review, promotion, disciplinary action, and dismissal and will be referred to as Academic Personnel Policy.

The development of both new and amended (Note 1) Academic Personnel Policies (Note 1) for Trustee consideration is delegated jointly to the Faculty and the Academic Administration—President, Provost, and the Deans of Colleges. The Faculty review of proposed Academic Personnel Policy should occur within the faculty governance structure and must include a vote of the Faculty. The dissemination of Academic Personnel Policy is also the joint responsibility of the Faculty and Academic Administration.

The responsibility for maintaining effective university-wide educational policies, procedures and rules is delegated to the Faculty. The Board of Trustees expects the Faculty to maintain high standards and a nationally competitive educational environment for all Lehigh students. In the unlikely event that the Faculty votes to adopt an educational rule, procedure, or policy that, in the judgment of the Provost, is contrary to the best interests of the University, the Provost is responsible for requesting a Presidential review of the matter. If a negotiated resolution cannot be reached, the President has the delegated authority to sustain or veto the faculty action and the responsibility to inform the Board of Trustees and the Faculty of his decision and reasons for it.

To meet its policy obligations, the Faculty is responsible for maintaining an active and healthy governance structure (Note 3) and for abiding by the provisions of its own governance structure. The policy and management decisions under Faculty jurisdiction must be consistent with Board of Trustee actions and University Policies and meet the same legal and fiscal standards required of all Lehigh University policies. Finally, the Faculty is welcome to make known to the Board of Trustees, the University Administration, or the campus community its collective judgment on any campus issue through a sense of the faculty resolution.
IV. ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES

Of growing importance in a modern university is a third body of policy that rests between University Policy and routine operating procedures. It can best be called Administrative Policy. This section sets campus standards for the development approval, dissemination, and implementation of Administrative Policy.

The University must be administered on firm legal and financial grounds consistent with University and Faculty Policies. Since the administration of the campus also affects the daily lives of faculty, staff, and students in significant ways, the creation and application of Administrative Policies should be a known and open process and should appropriately balance the needs of the institution and the individual.

Important campus administrative responsibilities include, but are not limited to responsibility for (Note 1) student life, finance, business services and practices, human resources, information technology, athletics, fund raising, and sponsored projects. Because of the size, breadth, and importance of these areas, Administrative Policy should be separated into a set of suitable sub categories and each one assigned by the President to the specific Senior Administrator responsible for that functional area, usually a vice president.

There should, however, be a basic commonality to the management of these important areas of Administrative Policy. In particular, the following four steps should be used across the campus to establish Administrative Policies:

1. Administrative Policies should be drafted by professionals in the appropriate policy area.

2. An appropriate Advisory Panel that includes significant representation from the faculty and other key constituencies should be identified for each administrative policy area. These Advisory Panels may be constructed from existing faculty, staff, and student committees or created by other means as appropriate. They, should review all draft Administrative Policies in an administrative policy area, and assist in their revision. Appropriate Faculty standing committees should also be invited to review and provide timely comments on proposed administrative policies. (Note 4)

3. When the Advisory Panel and the designated Senior Administrator are satisfied with a draft Administrative Policy, it should be circulated to the campus for a period of comment.

4. The Senior Administrator should determine whether or not an Administrative Policy is ready for final approval and implementation or needs further revision.

The President has the delegated authority to approve Administrative Policies developed using the above process. The designated Senior Administrator for an Administrative
Policy area has responsibility for the effective dissemination of the Administrative Policies and the execution of these policies with appropriate rules and procedures.

V. OPERATIONAL ELEMENTS

The long-term implementation (Note 1) of this Policy on Policies will require an investment of time and energy by the Lehigh community. (Note 1) The benefits to Lehigh should, however, far outweigh the effort. Among the advantages to the University are: a uniform and better understood organization of policies; the elimination of any serious policy gaps, inconsistencies and contradictions; a wider campus understanding of the policy development process; an improved dissemination methodology; and easier access to the benefits of specific policies for all members of the Lehigh community.

To fully benefit from the policy structure described in the previous sections the University should:

- Maintain a list of Administrative Policy Areas and the senior administrators responsible for them;
- Maintain an inventory of policies by their classification;
- Employ comprehensive and effective dissemination processes for all types of policies;
- Identify and address needs, inconsistencies and contradictions in campus policies continuously over time.

The Rules and Procedures of the Faculty is currently the primary repository of Academic Personnel Policies. Due to its importance, the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty (or similar documents compiling Academic Personnel Policies) will be expected to be accurate, current, usable, consistent and accessible. (Note 5)

Within the colleges the deans are responsible for maintaining an appropriate college policy structure guided by the principles of this document. Furthermore, it is their responsibility to ensure that all college policies, procedures and rules are consistent with University, Faculty, and Administrative Policies as prescribed in sections II, III and IV.

Policies of the University are intended to state important guiding principles, general rules and expectations, and organizational responsibilities applicable to the University community. The implementation of these policies frequently requires operational procedures or rules such as time frames for certain actions, requirements for providing information, the assignment of certain duties etc. It is the responsibility of policy...
administrators to distinguish between policy matters and operational ones and to devise appropriate procedures and rules to implement policies.

Finally it is the expectation of the Board of Trustees that Lehigh University will have an effective policy structure that is kept current, is easily accessible, covers all major areas, and is fully utilized.
Notes on the changes:

Note 1
Several changes (eight to be precise) are labeled "note 1". These proposals are changes that improve the document by improving the English or clarifying the meaning, but do not change the intent or practical operation of the document.

Note 2
The Board and the Administration want it to be clear that legal responsibility lies with the Board and that a faculty vote cannot be binding on the Board. The Faculty Steering Committee, on the other hand, feels that it is of great importance that the Faculty vote on every University Policy. Otherwise, consultation with the Faculty on a major issue might be limited to conversations with only a few members of the Faculty. The wording proposed is a compromise on both sides and seems to meet the concerns of both groups.

Note 3
The deleted phrase is problematic: It suggests that Lehigh is not among the "best," but should imitate the "best." It presents logical difficulties if "the best universities" have governance structures that are not mutually consistent with ours.

Note 4
As the current Policy Structure stands, it would appear that, in the drafting of policies, an established Faculty Committee could be bypassed by forming a new Advisory Panel. The additional clause would require that any relevant, existing, Standing Faculty Committee be incorporated into the work of an Advisory Panel.

Note 5
We feel that the revised wording more correctly represents the status of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, and the way in which it should inform university policies.
RATIONALE

During the last few years, the Faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees have worked together to put into place several new policies that govern the way things are done at Lehigh. The new harassment policy is one example of such work. Another is the negotiation between the Faculty Steering Committee, the Rules and Procedures Subcommittee, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees to amend the Policy Structure statement passed by the Board in 2002.

The Board of Trustees, in June of 2002, approved a document entitled “Policy Structure.” This statement sets out formally the way in which new policies are to be developed and implemented. It is, in short, a policy on policies. At that time, the Faculty Steering Committee and other university faculty committees felt that the document was sent to the Board without adequate consultation of the Faculty. Moreover, members of those committees would have wished to see changes in some specific passages.

Between June 2002 and December of 2004, a series of exchanges between the Faculty Steering Committee and the R and P Subcommittee on the one hand and members of the Board of Trustees and the Administration on the other addressed these differences of opinion.

The result of these negotiations is a set of changes that we feel substantially improve the Policy Structure document. In order for these revisions to be implemented, they will have to be put to a full meeting of the Board of Trustees. We now wish to present the changes to the Faculty at large for discussion and a vote at the next faculty meeting, so that the degree of support for the changes among the Faculty can be assessed.

Attached to this message is a Word document incorporating the changes we propose (in color, underlined) and also indicating the passages in the 2002 statement that we wish to delete or change. At the end are notes commenting on or explaining the change. The existing Policy Structure statement, in effect since June 2002, is available at www.lehigh.edu/~policy/university/structure.htm.

The most important revisions are the following:

Section II – New language in paragraphs 2 and 3 clarifies and strengthens the Faculty’s role in developing policy.

Section IV – Changes in paragraph 4 spell out more specifically the roles of Faculty Standing Committees in policy changes.
changes in the social environment outside higher education. I think you are all aware of the scrutiny placed on higher education in recent years. Along with that scrutiny has come demands for greater accountability. Public institutions are under somewhat more pressure than private institutions, but there have been calls for national standards to which all institutions would be held. The regional accreditation commissions have pressed hard for recognition that one of the greatest strengths of higher education in America is the diversity of institutions. In view of that strength, they argue, institutions should evaluate themselves with the assistance of their peers. Policy makers have, at least for the time being, accepted that principle, but it is clear that if self-evaluation is not to be replaced by external, centrally administered standards for assessing institutions, the commissions will need to demonstrate that self-evaluation provides clear evidence of student learning and that assessment of student learning influences pedagogy and curriculum.
University faculty meeting
21 March 2005
Comments re MSCHC accreditation project. Carl Moses

Timeframe:
- Evaluation team visit in April 2008
- Self-study steering committee being formed this spring and will be in place at the beginning of the fall semester

Between now and then, we must
- Determine how we will conduct our self-study, including selecting the topic or topics for self-study
- Develop the subcommittees that will pursue two parallel processes
  - Document compliance with the 14 MSCHC standards
  - Conduct and document the institutional self-study
- Deliver a compliance report in fall 2007
- Deliver the self-study in January 2008

My role in this process is to manage the accreditation review project by chairing the steering committee and making sure that information flows where it needs to flow. The steering committee is accountable to the provost, who is the person chiefly responsible for the accreditation outcome. The committee will include administrators, faculty, staff, and students and will have explicit connections to alumni and trustees.

Characteristics of project:
- **Transparent**
  - Open access to information
  - We will provide regular updates
  - We will establish a website for providing information and updates
- **Transformative**
  - Greg, Mohamed, and the deans are determined that the purpose of this process is not merely to go through the motions of responding to MSCHC’s expectations but to integrate energy from across the institution through the self-study and, ultimately, improve Lehigh
- **Inclusive**
  - There are many stakeholders who will be included in the process
  - We will provide opportunities for input and feedback
- **Institution-specific**
  - The accreditation process addresses the institution’s mission and objectives
  - The accreditation “standards” are broad and adaptable to the institution’s mission and objectives

I want to close by telling you that this review will be different from what we’ve experienced in the past. Even since our last Periodic Review Report to MSCHC (in 2003), the accreditation process has evolved toward more campus involvement, more focus on evidence and documentation, and greater emphasis on outcomes and assessment. There are good reasons for that evolution, and they mostly have to do with
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS
MARKETING CURRICULUM REVISION

INCREASING THE NUMBER OF CREDIT HOURS REQUIRED BY UNDERGRADUATE MARKETING MAJORS FROM 15 TO 18

Proposal
We propose that the number of credits required to complete the undergraduate “marketing major” be increased from 15 credit hours to 18 credit hours.

Rationale
This recommendation is part of marketing faculty’s mission to continuously improve the curriculum to ensure that the educational experience offered to Lehigh University students electing to major in marketing is academically rigorous. The proposal does not change the number of required courses but only the number of electives. Figure 1 presents a summary of requirements.

The increased number of credits will enable the students to have stronger preparation for their chosen career tracks. Moreover, broadening their skill base will enable them to better meet the challenges posed by the rapid globalization of the professional labor pool. The marketplace is demanding more from our majors and we as faculty are responding to that challenge. This increase in credit hours along with the planned continuous improvements in our courses, and stronger career orientation will result in a more rigorous curriculum and graduates with superior preparation.

After the revised curriculum is approved, the marketing faculty will prepare an internal advising document. This document will list the rationale for career tracks, target audience, value proposition, suggested course work, and so on. This internal document will be finalized after consultation with the Undergraduate Program Director, Career Center Director, and so on.

Resource Implications
We expect some redistribution and increase of enrollment in selected elective course offerings (no required course is affected by this recommendation and there is no change in the required courses). However, this proposal does not involve adding new courses and therefore will be managed with existing faculty resources and planned faculty additions. Further, there are no other significant resource implications including library and computing services, or other financial resources. In addition, all the non-marketing courses are already approved as part of the last round of curriculum revisions. Therefore, we are not seeking faculty approval for these courses. In addition, IPD faculty members have been further consulted to accommodate marketing majors interested in the new product arena. This practice has been continuing for several semesters.

Time Plan of Implementation
This proposal is scheduled to become effective in fall semester 2005. Although efforts will be made to convince the students of the benefits of this change, consistent with Lehigh’s policy,
students who elected to become marketing majors under the previous catalog will be allowed to complete their program following the requirements in the year of their matriculation.

**Figure 1. Sequence of Coursework for Marketing Majors (** indicates required course)

- **MKT 211 (Principles of Marketing)**  
  *(Prerequisite: ECO 1)*  
  *(Taken in the Fall semester of the Junior year)*

- **MKT 311 (Buyer Behavior) (prerequisite: MKT 211)**  
  **MKT 312 (Marketing Research) (prerequisites: MKT 211, ECO 145, ECO 115)**  
  These can be taken concurrently or as 311-312 sequence  
  *(Typically taken in the Spring semester of the Junior year)*

Three*** elective courses  
These courses can be taken in any order or together *(prerequisite MKT 211)*

- **MKT 387 (Marketing Strategy)**  
  *(prerequisites: MKT 311 and 312)*  
  *(Taken in the Senior year)*

**List of Elective Courses:**

**Marketing Electives (3 courses or 9 credits from the following or from approved non-marketing courses)**

- MKT 313: Integrated Marketing Communications
- MKT 331: Electronic Commerce
- MKT 320: Global Marketing Strategies
- MKT 321: Business-to-Business Marketing
- MKT 319: Development & Marketing of New Products
- MKT 325: Quantitative Marketing Analysis
- MKT 332: Sales Management
- MKT 348: Management of Marketing Channels
- MKT 360: Marketing Practicum
- MKT 366: Marketing of Services
- MKT 371: Directed Readings
- MKT 372: Special Topics
Other Marketing courses added in the future

Courses from outside that were already approved. Specifically, we have consulted with IPD to accommodate those people who are interested in the new product area (EVERY OTHER COURSE ALREADY EXISTS IN THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PROPOSAL – SO, NO FACULTY APPROVAL IS Sought FOR THIS LIST; THIS ONLY APPEARS FOR INFORMATION)

- Public Relations Principles (JOUR 127)
- Media Ethics & Law (JOUR 122)
- Mass Communication & Society (JOUR 327)
- Graphic Communication (ART 53)
- Design Process (DES 60)
- Purchasing & Supply Management (SCM 309)
- Integrated Logistics (SCM 354)
- Integrated Product Development (BUS 211, 212)
- Game Theory (ECO 358)
- Marketing of Services (MKT 366)
- Pricing Strategy & Negotiations (SCM 328)
- Introduction to Mathematical Economics (ECO 351)
- Advanced Statistical Methods (ECO 352)
- Econometrics (ECO 357)
- Game Theory (ECO 358)
- International Finance (ECO/FIN 340)
- Alternative World Futures (IR 23)
- The United States in the Global Economy (IR 72)
- Globalization and World Politics (IR 120)
- Information Systems Applications in E-Business (BIS/SCM 342)
Subject: Marketing Proposals

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 2005 13:12:12 -0500
From: Larry Taylor <lt0@lehigh.edu>
To: pg0 <pg0@lehigh.edu>, med4 <med4@lehigh.edu>, mds8 <mds8@lehigh.edu>,
cmr4 <cmr4@lehigh.edu>, lw0 <lw0@lehigh.edu>, ao01 <ao01@lehigh.edu>,
sr0 <sr0@lehigh.edu>

Dear CPC:

I will need to call our first meeting for Thursday, Feb. 3rd at noon.
In the future, I will try to alternate between Thursday and Friday.

The purpose of our meeting will be to discuss the marketing curriculum
revision and a new course in marketing. As far as I can tell, the
change will entail increasing the number of elective courses from an
approved list. In the future, students will be guided to different
tracks in order to complete their degree.

Here are my issues so far.

1) Eco./Fin. 348 is listed as a possible elective. Since the same
course cannot count two places, this precludes a CSE minor in
International Economics if the student wishes to count this course as
part of the marketing major. Without an increase in the number of
credits for the marketing major, however, the student could both major
in marketing and minor in international economics -- without having to
worry about the double-counting issue. In other words, increasing the
marketing major to 18 credit hours increases the complexity of our
current system. Do the benefits outweigh such costs? Please give this
issue some thought.

2) Eco. 352 is no longer offered, and Eco. 245 is now a prerequisite
for Eco. 357. If a lot of marketing students opt to take 245 and 357,
there are resource implications for the economics department. This is a
resource implication that I have actually thought about, though there
may be others that I haven't thought about.

As usual, please keep this conversation confidential. I think that our
next meeting should be closed so that we can discuss these issues among
ourselves before involving the administration. It is very important for
us to think through this proposal very carefully before approving it (or
a modified version) for faculty consideration.

Best,

Larry